



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,944	11/30/2001	Sanjeev Kumar Chandak	05793.3077	3988
22852	7590	11/01/2007		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER VAN BRAMER, JOHN W	
			ART UNIT 3622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/996,944	Applicant(s) CHANDAK ET AL.	
	Examiner John Van Bramer	Art Unit 3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-11,15-21 and 25-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-11,15-21 and 25-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 20, 2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on August 20, 2007 cancelled no claims. No new claims were added, and Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31-36 were amended. Thus, the currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1, 5-11, 15-21, and 25-36.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
4. Claims 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the

application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner is unable to find in the applicants specification any disclosure to support the limitations of independent claim 31 that describe "providing the second amount of reward points to the financial account", then "modifying a third amount of reward points based upon the second amount of reward points, to generate a fourth amount of reward points" and then "providing the fourth amount of award points to the financial account". Additionally, the examiner can find no support in the specification for the limitations of dependent claims 35 and 36 which indicate that the second amount of reward points is subtracted from the third amount of reward points, after the second amount of reward points have been already provided to the financial account as required by claim 31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 7-11, 17-21, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker et al (U.S. Patent Number: 6,018,718).

Claims 1 and 7: Walker discloses a method for managing a financial account for a consumer, comprising:

- a. Providing the financial account to the consumer. (Col 3, lines 16-25; Col 4 lines 18-27; Col 6 lines 15-29; and Col 7 line 61 – Col 8 line 60)
- b. Providing a reward incentive parameter that indicates a predetermined amount of reward points to associate with the financial account based on a predetermined payment amount to the financial account. (Col 3, lines 16-25; Col 4 lines 18-27; Col 6 lines 15-29; and Col 7 line 61 – Col 8 line 60; Col 9, lines 1-55)
- c. Receiving a payment for a particular amount to the financial account. (Col 6, lines 15-29; Col 6 lines 48-56; Col 7, line 61 through Col 8, line 12; and Col 9, line 56 through Col 10, line 27)
- d. Determining an amount of reward points to provide to the financial account based on the reward incentive parameter and the received payment amount, wherein determining the amount of reward points includes reducing the determined amount of reward points based on a determination that at least one of the received payment amount is below a minimum payment amount or the received payment was received after a payment due date. (Col 6, lines 15-29 and Col 6 lines 37-47, and Col 7, lines 61-67; Col 9, lines 1-55; Col 10, lines 3-13; Col 11, lines 1-12 and Col 11, lines 32-44)
- e. Providing the determined amount of reward points to the financial account. (Col 10, lines 3-13)
- f. Adding the provided amount of reward points to a reward point balance to generate an updated reward point balance, wherein the updated reward point

balance can be used to receive a consumer good. (Col 6, lines 15-29 and Col 6 lines 37-47, Col 10, lines 3-13, and Col 11, lines 1-12)

Claim 8: Walker discloses the method of claim 7, wherein the reward distribution parameter is based on a financial risk associated with a customer corresponding to the financial account. (Col 7 lines 13-50)

Claim 9: Walker discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the reward distribution parameter is adjusted based on a change in the financial risk associated with the customer. (Col 8, lines 51-60)

Claim 10: Walker discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: determining whether a customer corresponding to the financial account is eligible for one or more consumer goods based on the determined amount of reward points associated with the financial account; and providing an indication to the customer reflecting a result of the determining whether the customer is eligible for one or more consumer goods. (Col 9, lines 36-55)

Claim 11: Walker discloses a system for managing a financial account for a consumer, comprising:

- a. Means for providing the financial account to the consumer. (Col 3, lines 16-25; Col 4 lines 18-27; Col 6 lines 15-29; and Col 7 line 61 – Col 8 line 60)

- b. Means for providing a reward incentive parameter for the financial account that indicates a predetermined amount of reward points to associate with the financial account based on a predetermined payment amount to the financial account.
(Col 3, lines 16-25; Col 4 lines 18-27; Col 6 lines 15-29; and Col 7 line 61 – Col 8 line 60; Col 9, lines 1-55)
- c. Means for receiving a payment for a particular amount to the financial account.
(Col 6, lines 15-29; Col 6 lines 48-56; Col 7, line 61 through Col 8, line 12; and Col 9, line 56 through Col 10, line 27)
- d. Means for determining an amount of reward points to provide to the financial account based on the reward incentive parameter and the received payment amount, wherein the means for determining the amount of reward points includes a means for reducing the determined amount of reward points based on a determination that at least one of the received payment amount is below a minimum payment amount or the received payment was received after a payment due date. (Col 6, lines 15-29 and Col 6 lines 37-47, and Col 7, lines 61-67; Col 9, lines 1-55; Col 10, lines 3-13; Col 11, lines 1-12 and Col 11, lines 32-44)
- e. Means for providing the determined amount of reward points to the financial account. (Col 10, lines 3-13)
- f. Means for adding the provided amount of reward points to a reward point balance to generate an updated reward point balance, wherein the updated

reward point balance can be used to receive a consumer good. (Col 6, lines 15-29 and Col 6 lines 37-47, Col 10, lines 3-13, and Col 11, lines 1-12)

Claim 17: Walker discloses the system of claim 11, wherein the means for determining an amount of reward points further comprises: means for determining the amount of reward points to associate with the financial account based on the amount of the received payment and a reward distribution parameter. (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 11, lines 32-44)

Claim 18: Walker discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the reward distribution parameter is based on a financial risk associated with a customer corresponding to the financial account. (Col 7 lines 13-50)

Claim 19: Walker discloses the system of claim 18, wherein the reward distribution parameter is adjusted based on a change in the financial risk associated with the customer. (Col 8, lines 51-60)

Claim 20: Walker discloses the system of claim 11, further comprising: means for determining whether a customer corresponding to the financial account is eligible for one or more consumer goods based on the determined amount of reward points associated with the financial account; and means for providing an indication to the

Art Unit: 3622

customer reflecting a result of the determining whether the customer is eligible for one or more consumer goods. (Col 9, lines 36-55)

Claim 21: Walker discloses a computer-readable medium including instructions for performing a method, when executed by a processor, for managing a financial account for a consumer, the method comprising:

- a. Providing the financial account to the consumer. (Col 3, lines 16-25; Col 4 lines 18-27; Col 6 lines 15-29; and Col 7 line 61 – Col 8 line 60)
- b. Providing a reward incentive parameter for the financial account that indicates a predetermined amount of reward points to associate with the financial account based on a predetermined payment amount to the financial account. (Col 3, lines 16-25; Col 4 lines 18-27; Col 6 lines 15-29; and Col 7 line 61 – Col 8 line 60; Col 9, lines 1-55)
- c. Receiving a payment for a particular amount to the financial account. (Col 6, lines 15-29; Col 6 lines 48-56; Col 7, line 61 through Col 8, line 12; and Col 9, line 56 through Col 10, line 27)
- d. Determining an amount of reward points to provide to the financial account based on the reward incentive parameter and the received payment amount, wherein determining the amount of reward points includes reducing the determined amount of reward points based on a determination that at least one of the received payment amount is below a minimum payment amount or the received payment was received after a payment due date. (Col 6, lines 15-29 and Col 6

lines 37-47, and Col 7, lines 61-67; Col 9, lines 1-55; Col 10, lines 3-13; Col 11, lines 1-12 and Col 11, lines 32-44)

- e. Providing the determined amount of reward points to the financial account. (Col 10, lines 3-13)
- f. Adding the provided amount of reward points to a reward point balance to generate an updated reward point balance, wherein the reward point balance can be used to receive a consumer good. (Col 6, lines 15-29 and Col 6 lines 37-47, Col 10, lines 3-13, and Col 11, lines 1-12)

Claim 27: Walker discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 21, wherein determining an amount of reward points further comprises: determining the amount of reward points to associate with the financial account based on the amount of the received payment and a reward distribution parameter. (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 11, lines 32-44)

Claim 28: Walker discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 27, wherein the reward distribution parameter is based on a financial risk associated with a customer corresponding to the financial account. (Col 7 lines 13-50)

Claim 29: Walker discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 28, wherein the reward distribution parameter is adjusted based on a change in the financial risk associated with the customer. (Col 8, lines 51-60)

Claim 30: Walker discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 21, the method further comprising: determining whether a customer corresponding to the financial account is eligible for one or more consumer goods based on the determined amount of reward points associated with the financial account; and providing an indication to the customer reflecting a result of the determining whether the customer is eligible for one or more consumer goods. (Col 9, lines 36-55)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5-6, 15-16, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al (U.S. Patent Number: 6,018,718).

Claim 5: Walker discloses the method of claim 1, wherein determining an amount of reward points further comprises: increasing the amount of reward points based on a determination that the customer has exceeded their designated performance value (Col 11, lines 11-32), but does not explicitly state that the performance value is

based upon a minimum payment amount. Walker does however indicate that the extent of monthly payments is a valid criteria for performance rewards (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 8, lines 51 – 60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create a targeted reward system in which a minimum payment amount was the criteria on which performance was evaluated. One would have been motivated to use a minimum payment amount as the targeted performance criteria in order to provide those customers with large balances an incentive to reduce their outstanding debt and therefore reduce the companies risk exposure.

Claim 6: Walker discloses the method of claim 1, wherein determining an amount of reward points further comprises: increasing the amount of reward points based on a determination that the customer has exceeded their designated performance value ((Col 11, lines 11-32), but does not explicitly state that the performance value is based upon a payment due date. Walker does however indicate that the payment due date is a valid criteria for performance rewards. (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 8, lines 51 – 60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create a targeted reward system in which payment due date was the criteria on which performance was evaluated. One would have been motivated to use payment due date as the targeted performance criteria in order to create an environment in which corporate cash flow and working capital could be accurately predicted.

Claim 15: Walker discloses the system of claim 11, wherein the means for determining an amount of reward points further comprises: increasing the amount of reward points based on a determination that the customer has exceeded their designated performance value (Col 11, lines 11-32), but does not explicitly state that the performance value is based upon a minimum payment amount. Walker does however indicate that the extent of monthly payments is a valid criteria for performance rewards (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 8, lines 51 – 60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create a targeted reward system in which a minimum payment amount was the criteria on which performance was evaluated. One would have been motivated to use a minimum payment amount as the targeted performance criteria in order to provide those customers with large balances an incentive to reduce their outstanding debt and therefore reduce the companies risk exposure.

Claim 16: Walker discloses the system of claim 11, wherein the means for determining an amount of reward points further comprises: increasing the amount of reward points based on a determination that the customer has exceeded their designated performance value ((Col 11, lines 11-32), but does not explicitly state that the performance value is based upon the payment due date. Walker does however indicate that the payment due date is a valid criteria for performance rewards. (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 8, lines 51 – 60). Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 3622

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create a targeted reward system in which payment due date was the criteria on which performance was evaluated. One would have been motivated to use payment due date as the targeted performance criteria in order to create an environment in which corporate cash flow and working capital could be accurately predicted.

Claim 25: Walker discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 21, wherein determining an amount of reward points further comprises: increasing the amount of reward points based on a determination that the customer has exceeded their designated performance value (Col 11, lines 11-32), but does not explicitly state that the performance value is based upon a minimum payment amount. Walker does however indicate that the extent of monthly payments is a valid criteria for performance rewards (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 8, lines 51 – 60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create a targeted reward system in which a minimum payment amount was the criteria on which performance was evaluated. One would have been motivated to use a minimum payment amount as the targeted performance criteria in order to provide those customers with large balances an incentive to reduce their outstanding debt and therefore reduce the companies risk exposure.

Claim 26: Walker discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 21, wherein determining an amount of reward points further comprises: increasing the amount of

reward points based on a determination that the customer has exceeded their designated performance value ((Col 11, lines 11-32), but does not explicitly state that the performance value is based upon the payment due date. Walker does however indicate that the payment due date is a valid criteria for performance rewards. (Col 7, lines 61-67 and Col 8, lines 51 – 60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create a targeted reward system in which payment due date was the criteria on which performance was evaluated. One would have been motivated to use payment due date as the targeted performance criteria in order to create an environment in which corporate cash flow and working capital could be accurately predicted.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed August 21, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - a. The applicant argues that Walker does not teach the reward criteria in which the amount of reward points is based upon a received payment amount which is below a minimum payment amount or the received payment was received after a due date. However, discloses on Page 7, lines 61-67 that behavior scores are valid reward criteria and can include extent of monthly payment or promptness of payment. Walker also discloses on Page 6, lines 15-29, that target monthly principle payments (Which represent a minimum payment amount, since

principle can only be paid once finance charges are covered.) are valid target criteria.

- b. The applicant argues that the examiners interpretation of Walker 's teaching regarding "determining the amount of reward points includes reducing the amount of reward points based on a determination that at least one of the received payment amount is below a minimum payment amount or the received payment was received after a payment due date" is not correct. The examiner has reviewed Walkers teaching in light of the applicant's arguments and stands by his original interpretation. The Walker reference teaches reducing the performance target to 90% of the original target. The applicant relies upon Fig 7, of Walker to assert that a reduction does not occur, but appears to have mistakenly misinterpreted the teaching of the Walker reference. The examiner points to Fig 8 of Walker to support his position. Fig. 8 discloses that a first target type and a first target parameter are determined. Then a performance value is determined. If the customer does not meet the performance value, a check is made to see if the performance was greater or less than 90% of the target. If it is less than 90% the target parameter is reduced and the second reward terms are set equal to the first reward terms. An example setting the second reward term as equal to the first reward term can be found in Fig. 4. Account ID 9999-9999-9999-9999 did not meet the first quarter target parameter so the target parameter was reduced and the reward terms remain the same. In order to determine how this results in a reduction, consider the annual amount of

reward points the customer can receive. Walker discloses that the customer does not receive the quarterly reward for the first quarter, but the quarterly reward for the second quarter is more attainable. If the customer fails to meet the second quarter target another reduction would occur to make the attainment of the reward more attainable. Each quarter in which the target is not reached to annual number of possible reward points decreases, but the ability to achieve a reward in the current quarter increases. Thus the limitations of the claim are taught by the Walker reference

Conclusion


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Van Bramer whose telephone number is (571) 272-8198. The examiner can normally be reached on 6am - 4pm Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


jvb


ERIC W. STAMBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600